App. F. IX-4

Previous References
312-34
173-33 1-4

Later References

193 5.
(Muzrai)

Preserved

82

File No. ~~82~~ 35

Serial Nos. 1-4

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 4

Part B for July 36.

SUBJECT.

Management of the properties attached to the temple of Sri Sureswara Swami at Thirthahalli

8/4 Messrs N Bhimachar & N. Ittur Srinivasa Rao } Advocates
No 115-6. d 27-7-36.

States that there are no reasons for interference with the orders of the Muz Court

R Sastri

Muz Appl 11 of 35-36. re: the management of the properties attached to the Temple of Sri Sureswara Swami - Tattahalli - Shimoga Dt.

and Revenue Secretariat

Muz File No. of 1935-6. [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

Petition dt 21.10.35 filed by Mr N. Bhimachar Advocate Bangalore city on behalf of Mr N. Madappiah Son of Ramappiah landholder residing in Halasanad Kundapur Taluk appealing against the order of the Muzrai Commissioner about the management of the properties attached to Sri Sureswara-Swami Temple at Tattahalli Shimoga Dt.

(1) Orders ~~Note~~ of the Gen Sec and the first member ~~dt 21/10/35~~ on the P 4

In person by Mr Bhimacharya - Filed for perusal - A report & the records will be called for.

(Sd). M. V. 21.10.35

Fr SL

(Intd) Mr S. P. R. 23.10.35

(2) Memo ~~of forwarded~~ forwarding the petition to M. C. is put up on the P. M. D. ~~is for Hand Signature~~

G.N. 24.10.35 ~~338~~ 25.10.35

(3) [illegible] 25/10

petition Sent to M. C

No 556/Muz 82-35-

Letter No Mg 687 35-36 dt 18 Nov 35 from the Muzrai Commissioner submitting Records connected with the appeal.

4) In Oct 1929 the present petr petitioned the S.D.O. in which he prayed for the restoration to him

GNA 25/10

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

2) Muz appl no 11 of 33

Muz File No. of 193

General and Revenue Secretariat

of the management of the temple & its lands. After obtaining a report from the Tahsildar, he ordered on 8/11/29 that the petr's request was inadmissible. Against this order of the S.D.O. there was an appeal before the D.C. vide flag C for the D.C's decision in the case (Muz appl no 3/29-30). The S.D.O. was ordered on 30/6/30 to proceed with the action he was taking re the temple & its lands and also to report as to the validity or otherwise of the claims of the heirs for the Vahivat ship. Thereupon the S.D.O. held an enquiry after summoning the concerned parties and has opined as follows in his report of 31.12.1933:— B C F.

× × × × ×

"The existence of a Vahivat itself is a necessary evil. The Vahivat if taken away from the opponent on account of unauthorised alienation of the Inam land should not in my opinion be revived in favour of any one else. On the other hand appointing Dharmadarsis and settling the quota of the Inam lands and managing the institution according to a scale to be fixed is always safer and better to prevent a repetition of mismanagement. But taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner is only enthusiastic

Muz appl no 11 of 35-36

*the appellant is the petr now before Govt.

about the proper management of the Temple & continuance of the Dharma instituted by his* ancestors I suggest that he must be made a Dharmadarsi & Convenor if such a committee is in future formed after the abolition of the Valuvat of the Opponent." —

5) While matters stood thus, a report was called for in connection with a petn on the same subject presented to the M.C. during July 3: On receipt of the above said report of the S.D.O., the D.C. ~~replied to the M.C.~~ submitted the entire records ~~and~~ and said that it was not possible to dispossess the Venkatakrishnayya, the opponent without considerable difficulty and ~~that~~ the Valuvat might remain with him subject to the supervision of a Committee of Dharmadarsis including an Agent of the Appellant. Thereupon the M.C. returned the papers with the direction that the appeal might be finally disposed of on merits, as no formal orders were passed. After hearing the parties the D.C. dismissed the appeal on 12-2-1935, the following being an extract of observations made by him in his decision: —

x x x x x

6) It is apparent that the present Valuvatdar —

& his immediate ancestors somehow usurped the office and wish now to adhere to it. There is no doubt some evidence of mismanagement but that is not quite sufficient to dispossess the present Vahivatdar of the right which has accrued to him to hold office. The appellant does not reside within the limits of Mysore & is a resident of Kundapur in British India & is thus not in a position to manage either effectively or usefully the affairs of the temple even if the management is made over to him - x x

x x x xx

7) Thereupon the petr went in appeal to the M.C: ~~who~~ the latter has not heard the parties and on going through records rejected the petn on the score that there were no ~~A~~ reasons sufficient enough to interfere with the abovesaid order of the W.C.

8) The records disclose that the respondent is merely an anubhavadar and he has no right for the Vahivatship, as his ancestors were merely attending to Archana work of the temple. Both the

Muz appl no 11 of 35-36 —

Serial No.

S.D.O & the D.C. have noticed some sort of mismanagement on the part of the respondent and his ancestors. There exists no reasons to show any consideration as the institution is a minor muzrai institution with ample landed property which will be better looked after if the management is entrusted to a committee of Dharmadarsis as in the case of all the other similar institutions. & it is further respectfully submitted that there would be no justification if the Vahivat is permitted to continue with the respondent in spite of the mismanagement noticed & reported upon by the muzrai officers.

Submitted for orders if the case may be posted for a hearing as it is not heard by him.

G.S. 8/1/36

Muz Collections 173-33-34 & 312-34-1 are also put up for refce.
B

G.S.

The Sub-Div. Officer in his report No. N.C.575/29-30 dated 8th Nov. 1929 admits that the affairs of the temple are being mis-managed and that its property has been alienated. The petitioner states that the temple which was built at a cost of Rs 20,000 was endowed with property worth Rs 50,000. The S.D.O. Shimoga,

O.U.S.

proposed ~~that~~ a board of Dharmadarsis should be appointed and a scale of expenditure fixed to prevent mismanagement. The Muzrai Commr. does not deal with the question of mismanagement and ~~misappropria~~ alienation of the lands of ~~the~~ temple in his order of $\frac{7}{17}$th July 1935. The petitioner's request for an investigation of ~~the~~ mismanagement and alienation of the inam lands is a point for orders. Govt. have power to ~~resume~~ assume management of the institution and resume to its property in such cases under section 18 of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation. The ~~petitioner~~ present holders of the ~~inamdar~~ inam lands of the temple have no legal right to possess them. ~~Such inam lands are liable to resumption by Govt.~~ If the alienee fails to prove his title to any inam land, the inam land is liable to full assessment under rule IX of the Inam Rules — page 224 of the Revenue Manual. And they are liable to resumption under para 274 of the

F

H

Revenue Manual, as they are Devadaya inam lands. The petitioner requests the grant of a personal hearing.

9.1.36.

C. C. Flag G for the typed copy.

10) The DC's order in the Muz. Commrs. office file (Flag D) is for perusal. In the last para of the order it is stated as follows: "It is however apparent that the present Vahivatdar and his immediate ancestors somehow usurped the office and wish now to adhere to it". In the earlier portion of this same order the DC says 'The Respondent has admitted the right of the appellant's ancestors to the Vahivatship but has contended that he and his ancestors have come to exercise the Vahivatship from a long time and his right therefore to continue as such cannot now be disturbed'. The D.C. goes on to say in the order that 'The appellant does not reside within the limits of Mysore and is a resident of Coondapur in Br. India and is thus not in a position to manage either effectively or usefully the affairs of the temple even if the management is th—

Misc appl 11 of 35-36 re: m
of properties belonging to Sri ~~Sureswara~~ Tatahalli

File No. of 193 6

General
Secre

him. The appellant in para 3 (d) of the appeal petn states "that the Respondent has not been personally managing the properties but wants to act as a manager of these endowments without being entitled for the same in any manner, as this office is not made hereditary". Whether this is so is not explained either by the D.C. or the M.C.; nor has it been refd to in their orders. If this is a fact the appellant who is admitted to be the descendant of the original Vahivatdars who have endowed large sums of money to the temple & constructed the temple at huge cost viz Rs 2000/- has a real grievance which requires to be redressed. The D.C. merely states that there are difficulties to dispossess the Respondent from the Vahivatship. Surely these cannot be insurmountable particulars when it is admitted by him that there is some mismanagement.

The appellant has requested that a hearing may be given before the case is disposed of. Perhaps the case may be heard & disposed of.

17/1/36

en: Secy)

12) Rao 22/1/36

First Member)

13) 24/1

Rao 27/1

27/1

GENERAL SE
17 JAN. 193
5471

OFFICE OF THE
FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL
25 JAN. 1936
No. 5201

Routine Notes.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

Muzrai Cases were posted for a hearing:—

Muz appl no 13 of 1934-35 by Kumbalur Giriyappa Ref the performance of abhisheka and other ceremonies by Brahmins on the annual Rathotsavaday to the deity of Sri Hanumantha devaru at Kumbalur Village Honnali Tk.

* the 'if [illegible]' rule [illegible] 8/5/36

2) Muz appl 11 of 35-36 Ref the [illegible] of property belonging to Sri [illegible] temple at [illegible] halli.

3) Muz Review no 5 of 1935-36 Ref succession ~~to~~ Sri Jangama Mutt at Kalya magadi Tk. (This is an adjourned Case)

* Called on 28/2/36 but adjourned at the [illegible] the [illegible] on 6th [illegible]

* As this is an adjourned Case it will be posted as soon as orders are passed about the date to which it may be posted

GS

(4) Orders are solicited as to ~~the date to which~~ these Cases may be posted for a hearing.

[illegible] 19/3

1) Whether the cases are to be heard or not in accordance with the instructions recently given by the I Member may be examined & a note put up. 18/3/36

N.B —Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form

G.R.S. III—3]

Routine Notes,

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.]

N.B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

Serial No.

d. 6/3/36.

Minute of the First Member in Muz. appl. no 2* of 35-36 re: taking Sadari with the deity of Sri Gnyanasunthabavani at T. Narasipur during the annual Dhabri Tavanam at the place:—

Heard after [illegible] of.

Note for office :— Such cases ne[ed] not be treated as regular appeals in as they do not come under the scope of the appeal* section in the Muzrai Regulation not being orders by the M[...] under the Muzrai Regulation.

* Page 10 of the draft Sec. 38.

17) The facts of the case are fully set forth in the D.C's order A.B. 10*/33-34 d. 12.2.1935 & it is against this order the petrs went in [illegible] before the M[...] & the appeal was rejected for reasons set forth in Muz. Comr's office note d. 7-7 (Vide also the End. no A.M. 34*/34-35 d. [illegible] issued to the petrs from the M.C's office.

× 9

× 4

× 4

18. The Instn. is a minor Muzrai Instn. and the appellant has no sort of claim or right over the affairs of the Instn. as seen from the records & also from the orders passed by the D.C. & the M.C. in the appeals before them

× 9

[illegible]

In the disposal of the appeal petn of the petr it has come to notice that there is some evidence of mismanagement by the Respondent – this has been admitted in the order of the D.C dt 12-2-35.

In view of what is stated in the last part of para 10 supra, the M.C will, if agreed, be asked to investigate the feasibility of removing Mr Venkatakrishnaiya (the respondent) from the Vahivatship & take necessary action for appointing suitable Dharmadarsis, if the P.W.D Concur be treated as a regular appeal. The file will be sent to Law Secn for favour of opinion ~~[illegible]~~

GS 8/5

19. The appellant Madappiah appeals against the order of the Muzrai Commr. confirming the order of the Dy. Commr., Shimoga Dt., rejecting the petitioner's claim to the vahivatdarship of Sri Sureswaraswami temple at Tirthahalli. This is therefore an appeal against an order appointing a 'vahivatdar made ~~under~~ in accordance with the rules under sec. 6 of the

H D

Serial No.

Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation, (Vide Instructions for the management of minor Muzrai institutions, page 122 of the Muzrai Manual). Since Section 38 of Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation permits an appeal in the case of all orders under any of the provisions of the Regulation, an appeal seems to be admissible in this case under Sec. 38 of the Regulation. Submitted with reference to para 15 of the notes.

9.5.36.

20. Is any point of law involved? If not, how could an appeal lie to Govt from the appellate decision of the M C?

Dcs 9/5/36

x Vide the last D

21. The Dy. Commr., Tumkur Dt., in his order x of 12th Feby. 1935 admits that the respondent Mr. K. V. Katakrishniah usurped the Vahivatdarship. Whether he can be allowed to, it although he is not legally entitled to it as admitted by the Dy. Commr., seems to be a point of law. This is one of the points urged by the appellant. (Vide

'para (f) of the appeal petition). Further the Dy. Commr. states in para 2 of ~~the~~ his order that ~~portions of~~ the lands of the temple were alienated in 1929 during the time of ~~the~~ respondant's grand-father. This appropriation of the property of a Muzrai institution is a valid excuse for dismissing the present Vahivatdar. But ough mismanagement is admitted neither ovt. nor M.C. or the D.C. have ~~not~~ taken any action to emove him. There is no dispute about the act of mismanagement. But whether the existing e Vahivatdar should be retained ~~by the respondent~~ although ovt. can take action under Sec. 18 of e Religious and Charitable Institutions Regulation, to remove him ~~Regulation~~ seems to be therefore a question f enforcing the law on this point. ~~The appellant~~ One of the appellant's grounds appeal is the failure to provide a emedy for the mismanagement eferred to above. (Vide para (i) of the ppeal petition). Further the Govt. can eview ~~any~~ the decision in any case if hey choose under section 39 of the Religious d Charitable Institutions Regulation. It

x. Vide Para 2 facts of the

68 | Muz appl 11 of 35-36 re: The m of the properties attached to the temple of Sri Someswaraswami Tirthahalli Shimoga Dt.

General and Revenue Secretariat Muz File No. of 1935-6 [App. F. III—2

Serial No.

is a point for orders whether Govt. should ~~to~~ review the decision of the Muzrai Comr. confirming the Dy. Commr's order in this case.

~~[illegible]~~ 9.5.36

22) The case will, if approved, be posted for hearing as already ordered at para 13.

Gen. Secy)

~~[illegible]~~, 23) [illegible] 11/5/36. Secy 9/5

First Member)

64750 / 1215

24) 15/6 [illegible] 15/5 Secy

Posted to Saturday the

26 The Case was called on Saturday the 11th July 1936. The Counsel for the appellant was present and was heard. ~~The Counsel for the~~ Respondent with his counsel was present & heard. Orders reserved

27)

Order

28 There are no reasons

NOTE—Contn Sheet. WD 03594—GPB—30,000—18-7-35 for interference with the order of the M.C. It is understood that a a Comee of Dharmadarsis is already in existence for this temple. If so the question of appointing the petr as a member may be considered by the D C & the MC

22/7

29 22/7

Draft
DCS 23/7/36

23.7.36.

Issue
DCS 24/7/36

Memo No 155 of 27.7.36 to the Advocate for the appellant forwarding copy of the decision in the case specified therein.

No 156 of 27.7.36 to the Advocate for the respondent forwarding copy of the order passed on the case referred to therein.

Memo No 157 of 27.7.36 to the Muzrai Commissioner forwarding copy of the order for necessary action — B 28/7/36

8 14

MYSORE COURT FEE TWO RUPEES

N. B. Acharya
21-10-35

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT MUZRAI BR.
440
21. OCT. 1935
21/10/35

In person
by Mr Bheemachary

FIRST MEMBER [illegible] COUNCIL
22 OCT. 1935
No. 2462

Muz 82-35

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE

MAHARAJA IN MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Muz. Appeal. NO. 11 of 35- 36

Sent for perusal
A report and the
records will be
called for.
M O
21/10/35

Appellant:- M. Madappiah, son of Ramappiah.
Land-holder, residing in
Halasanod. Kundapur Tq., (for
purposes of this case)
care of :-
N. Bheema Charya, B.A., LL.B.,
Advocate, Sultanpet.
Bangalore City.

21/10

Respondant:- K. Venkatakrishniah, Retired -
District Education officer.
residing at Thirthahalli.

23/10

Under Section 272 Mysore Land Revenue Code

Re:- the right of managing the properties attached to the Temple of Sree Sureswara Temple of Tirthahalli, Shimoga District.

24/10

This appeal petition of the appellant abovenamed most respectfully begs to showeth as follows:-

1). That in preferring this appeal against the order passed by the learned Muzarai Commissioner in Appeal NO34 of 34-35, whose certified copy dated 17-7-35 is filed here-with, the appellant begs to set-forth the following grounds of appeal among others:-

Grounds of appeal.

(1). That the -

the learnead Muzarai Commissioner erred in not giving an opportunity to the Appellant to urge his grounds before him by way of argument.

(2). That the learnead Muzarai Commissioner has erred in not having passed a considered - Judgement, on the merits of the case.

(3). That the learnead Muzari Commissioner has failed to take into consideration the following aspects of the case:-

(a). That having conceded the right of the Appellant to be the vihivatdar, as the descendant of the Donors of these Endowments, the learnead Muzarai Commissioner ought to have passed an order to remove the present Respondant Vihivatdar, when the mismanagement of the Endowments was admitted.

(b). The learnead Muzarai Commissioner has failed to consider that this Respondant's ancesstors were appointed as'Archakas only' but gradully they usurped the management, with a view to benefit them-selves by mismanaging the properties.

(c). That the learnead Muzarai Commissioner has failed to take into consideration that thi post of "Arachaka ship" is meant to render personal service only. But now contrary to the orignal ter the Respondant has appointed a person and is g ing the work done by him, which has resulted in mis-management of every affair. connected with the Temple.

(d). That the learnead Muzarai Commissioner has failed to take into consideration that the

the Respondant has not been personally managing the properties, but wants to act as a manager of these Endowments with-out being entitled for the same in any manner, as this office is not made Heriditary.

(e). That the learnead Muzarai Commissioner has completely ignored, the prayer of the Appellant, which was quite bona-fide and expedient in the present state of affairs, and to the effect either to appoint him (Appellant) as Vihiwatdar or to appoint ~~him~~ Dharmadarsies, to manage and supervise the affairs.

(f). That the learnead Muzarai Commissioner erred inholding that by holding the ~~position~~ office of the Archakas from a long time, ~~neither~~ the respondant or his ancesstors had acquired any adverse possession.

(g). That further, in view of the Temple properties being alieanated by the Respondant, the learnead Mazarai Commissioner ought to have dispossessed the Respondant, of the Temple - properties and removed him from Archaka-ship.

(h). The fact that the Appellant is residing 40 miles away from the Temple, ought not to have been made a paramount ground of consideration in refusing to appoint this appellant as vahivatdar.

(i). That though the Mismanagement of the Temple properties is conceded by the learnead Muzarai Commissioner, the order passed him -

him provides no remedy to erradicate these evils, since he is made to continue as the vahivatdar of the said Temple properties, under the present order.

(j). That, the lower authorities have failed to take into consideration, and give effect to the offers made by this amounts, to set-right the mismanagement, in view of the fact, that the endowments to the extent of R. 50,000/- made by his ancecsstors, are practically ~~waited~~ wasted now, since no 'Puja' is performed in the recognised way.

(k). For that the humble appellant prays that on perusal of the records which establish- beyond doubt, the gross mismanagement of the -- enodowments ~~and~~ by bringing the Temple built by the ancesstors of the appellant at a cost of R. -- R. 20,000/- to runis, that the Benigh Government of High Highness the Maharaja may be graciously pleased to order the appellant-Donor to be the vahivatdar, or in the alternative that a Board of Dharmadarsis be constituted to manage the - properties and make suitable scheme and arrangements for the purpormance of puja, as other-wise, the entire object of this huge Endowment would ~~be~~ totally fail, and the Respondant by means of private alienation would keepout all the remaining properties even, as he has been found to be effected alienations of these Temple properties.

(l). Further the appellant most humbly prays that the Government of High Highness the Maharaja may be pleased. to hear the Appellant, before any order may be passed, as he was refused this opportunity bedfore the learnead Revenue

Revenue Commissioner, against whose order this appeal is preferred.

Bangalore.
Dated. 21st.Oct 1935.

Advocate for Appellant.

OFFICE
HC 40 35-36
9 OCT. 1935

Memo No 556/Muz 382-35-2 Dated 25-10-1935

Forwarded with compliments to the Muzrai Commissioner for favour of a report together with entire records connected with the appeal

By order

For General Secretary to Govt

26.10.35

gl 7250 11/11

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE
9 NOV 1935
SHIMOGA DISTRICT

12/11

Memo

Forwarded with compliments to the Deputy Commissioner Shimoga District for favour of a report together with the entire records connected with the case.

Ramanna

4/11/35 for Muzrai Commissioner

4923
R3

Memo

Forwarded to the Amildar Fermahals Taluk for immediate submission of the record with a detailed report.

R.3.C. 2-2/35
Oct 4

OFFICE
13 NOV. 35
SHIMOGA DISTRICT

9L 796
22/11

DDC

Submitted to the Deputy Commissioner Shimoga. The connected records in question have been submitted with this office No R-3-C. 2-2/35 dated 3-11-35.

16/11

[illegible]

[illegible] -

నం॥ Appl 34/34-35 [illegible] 17-7-35

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] (నం॥ [illegible] బి.ఏ. ఎల్.ఎల్.బి [illegible])

[illegible]

[illegible]

Sd/. N. Madhava Rao
Inam Commissioner

[illegible] నం॥ Appl 34/34-35
[illegible] 29-6-35
[illegible]

Copy applied for by Mr. K. P. Somasekhara Rao on 26-8-35
" ready on 17-9-35
" delivered on 23-9-35
No. of words 62
Copying fees 0-1-6
Comparing " 0-0-2
0-1-8

Copied by S. Jagannadha Rao
Compared by Hanumantha Rao

True Copy

Ramaswamaya
Manager
Inam Comm's Office

N. Bheemacharya, B.A., LL.B.,
ADVOCATE

೨ ರೂ TWO RUPEES ۲-روپے

23

~~In the Court of the~~ Before the Government of Mysore at **Bangalore.**

Filed by Mr. Bh[illegible]

Appeal **No.** **of** **193**5 **193**6

Plaintiff
Petitioner
Appellant

Defendant
Opponent
Respondent

Madappiah **Vs** K. Venkatakrishniah

The appellant above named do by these presents retains,

MR. N. BHEEMACHARYA, B.A., LL. B.,
ADVOCATE

to appear in the above case and to take all steps necessary in connection therewith and to conduct the same on My/Our behalf to judgment.

I/We further empower him to execute any decree or order that may be passed in My/Our behalf; to receive from the Court such sums of money as I/We may be entitled and grant receipts therefore; to withdraw or compromise the above case and fully represent Me/Us in all his acts and to appoint if necessary substitutes to him in his absence.

I/We also hereby undertake to pay all Fees costs and such other charges which may be incurred by him and to confirm and ratify all acts done by the said counsel in so doing.

Known to me and signed
in my presence

President Panchayat Court [illegible]
10 · 10 · 1935

BANGALORE.

Accepted

N. Bheemacharya
Advocate for Appellant

10·35

Sree Rama Press, Bangalore City

24

No. HC. 46 - 35-36
Encls. 3 files

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER,
IN MYSORE.

Dated Bangalore, 14th December 1935.

18 DEC 1935
687
16

FROM
K. V. ANANTARAMAN, Esq., B.A.,
~~N. MADHAVA RAO, Esq., B.A., B.L.,~~
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Muz 82-35-3

TO
M. Venkatesa Iyengar, Esq., M.A.,
Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
General *Department.*

GENERAL SECRETARIAT
16 DEC. 1935

SIR,

17/12

Appeal petition of Mr. M. Madappiah in re: his claim to the vahivat of Sri Sureswara Devaru Temple, Tirthahalli.

Adverting to your Memo No.556/Muz.82-35-2 dated the 25th October 1935 calling for a report together with the entire records re: the above, I have the honor to forward herewith the file of vernacular records received with the Shimoga District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.Muz.C.883-180/35-36 dated the 10th December 1935 as also this office files Nos. App.34/34-35 and D2 Dis.126/32-33 and to state that the facts of the case are contained in the Deputy Commissioner's order in App.No.10/33-34 dated the 12th February 1935.

The petition and its enclosures received with your Memo under advertance are returned herewith.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
K. Anantaraman
Muzrai Commissioner.

Hg. 11.7-36

೨ RUPEES ۲-روپئے

received
18/7/36

D.No 44 / 36-37

9/0

9/10/7/36
ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

Before the Govt of Mysore, Bangaloe.

೧೯35—36.ನೇ Misc Appeal ನಂಬರು 11.

~~ವಾದಿ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್~~ Appellant:-		~~ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಅಪೋನೆಂಟ್~~ Respondent:-
Madappiah.	Vs	Venkatakrishniah

ಮ॥ ರಾ॥ ನಿಟ್ಟೂರ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ರಾವ್, ಬಿ. ಎಸ್‌ಸಿ., ಬಿ. ಎಲ್., ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್,
ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ, ಇವರಿಗೆ
ಮ॥ ರಾ॥ K. R. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ [illegible] ಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್, ಬಿ.ಎ. ಬಿ.ಎಲ್

Respondent ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್‌ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೊನೆಯವರೆಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರುಗಿಸುವದಕ್ಕೂ ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರುಗಳನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ಜಾರಿ ಕ್ರಮ ನಡೆಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಹಣ ಬಾಕಿ ಹಣ ಸಹ ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ಪಡೆಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯನ್ನು ರಾಜೀ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವದಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ತಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೂ ನಾನು ಸ್ವತಃ ಇದ್ದು ನಡೆಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

Venkatakrishna

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ.
ತಾರೀಖು 10.7.36.

ರುಜು

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ಥ
ರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

KRG.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

N. Sreenivasa Rao 9.7.1936

K R Gopi Vallabha Iyengar
8.7.36

Supplied by B Puttu Rao, B. City

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Muzrai Appeal No. 11 of 1935-36.

Appellant.	Vs	Respondent
K. Madappiah, residing in Halasanod, Kundapur Taluk.		K. Venkatakrishnaiya, residing at ~~[illegible]~~ Thirthahalli, Shimoga District.

Subject

Appeal against the Muzrai Commissioner's order in the matter of the appellant's right to manage the temple of Sri Sureswaraswami at Thirthahalli and the properties endowed to it.

The case was called on Saturday the 11th July 1936. The Counsel for the appellant and the respondent with his Counsel were present and were heard.

O R D E R

There are no reasons for interference with the order of the Muzrai Commissioner. It is understood that a Committee of Dharmadarsis is already in existence for this temple. If so, the question of appointing the petitioner as a member may be considered by the Deputy Commissioner and the Muzrai Commissioner.

Memo No. /55 dated, Bangalore, the 25th July 1936.

Copy of the above is forwarded to (1) Mr N. B[illegible] [illegible] (2) Mr N. [illegible] [illegible]

Memo No/156 — Date 27.7.36 →

By order,

WD 0583—GPB—750—21-7-97

For General Secretary to Government

Memo No. 157/Muz 82-35-4 dated, Bangalore, the 27th July 1936.

Copy of the foregoing is forwarded with compliments to Muzrai Commissioner, for necessary action. Records received with letter No. H.C. 40/35-36 dated the 16th December 1935 are herewith returned.

By order,

(Sd)

for General Secretary to Governm

68/[illegible] Muz. 21]

[illegible]

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Muz. Appeal No. 11 1935-36

Appellant.	*Vs.*	Respondent
M. Madappiah residing in Halasanod Kundapur Tk.		K. Venkatakrishnaiya residing at Tirthahalli Shimoga Dt.

Subject.

Appeal against the M.C's order in the matter appellant's right to manage the temple of Sri Sureswara Swamie at Tirthahalli and the properties endowed thereto

The Case was called on Saturday the 11th July 1936. The Counsel for the appellant, and the Respondent with his Counsel were present and were

order ~~[illegible]~~

The case [illegible]

WD 0580—GPB—250—10-6-22

Dharmadarsi is already in existence for this temple – If so, the question of appointing the petitioner as a member may be considered by the D.C and ~~B.O.~~ the M.C

No. C. 155/Mz 82-35-4 dated ~~For Gen Secy.~~ 27th July 36

Copy to Mr. N. Bhimacharya BA LLB. Advocate (Sultanpet Bangalore City) for the appellant.

B.O

Secy

For Gen Sec

No. 156/Mz 82-35-4 ~~NDS~~ dated 27th July 36

Copy to Mr. Nittur Srinivasa Rao BSc BL. Advocate (Chickpet Bangalore City) for the respondent.

B.O

Secy

For Gen Sec.

No. 157/Mz 82-35-4 ~~NDS~~ dated 27th July 36

Copy to M.C. for necessary action. Encl Records

Records received with his letter No. L.C. 40/35-36 [illegible] 16-12-1935 are herewith sent.

M.

B.O

Secy

NDS For Gen Sec